

### **Remarks**

This Amendment After Final and Request for Continued Examination is in response to the Final Office Action dated **February 4, 2010**. The Office Action rejected claims 1, 16, and 18 on non-statutory double patenting grounds over Edwin (US 6,039,755) in view of Duran (US 7,524,445); rejected claims 1, 2, 5-11, 14-16, and 18-20 under 35 USC § 102(b) over Edwin; and noted that claim 17 would be allowable if re-written in independent form.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 16, and 18 are herein amended. Independent claims 1, 16, and 18 are herein amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 17. Claims 1, 16, and 18 are further amended to fix typographical errors. Claims 5, 7, 8, and 11 are amended to provide additional clarity and fix typographical errors.

Claims 2, 17, and 19 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In light of the foregoing amendments, Applicants submit that the immediate Application, with claims 1, 5-11, 14, 16, 18, and 20, is in condition for allowance.

Interview summary OK /PB/ 14 June 2010
---

### **Interview Summary**

Applicants Representatives thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the case on March 8, 2010. Applicants' Representatives and the Examiner discussed: incorporating the subject matter of claim 17 into each of the independent claims, clarifying the claims, and the double-patenting rejection.

### **Claim Rejections – Section 102**

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-11, 14-16, and 18-20 over Edwin is believed moot in light of the amendments to independent claims 1, 16, and 18.

### **Double Patenting**

With regard to the obviousness type double-patenting rejection of claims 1, 16, and 18 over Edwin and Duran, the double-patenting rejection is believed moot at least in light of the amendments to claims 1, 16, and 18, incorporating the subject matter of claim 17. Therefore, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.